



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/635,373	08/09/2000	Christopher R. King	068070.0102	5513
7590	05/24/2004		EXAMINER LIN, WEN TAI	
Baker Botts LLP 2001 Ross Avenue Dallas, TX 75201-2980			ART UNIT 2154	PAPER NUMBER 10
DATE MAILED: 05/24/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/635,373

Applicant(s)

KING ET AL.

Examiner

Wen-Tai Lin

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 April 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 31 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30, 32-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-34 are presented for examination.
2. Claim 31 is objected to for being unclear in the clause: "communicate anonymous electronic mail between directors." That is, the clause itself has an explicit meaning of "communicating anonymous electronic mail directly between two directors". To involve a third party (in this case an electronic mail module of the channel server), "relay" or "distribute" probably is a better term for the word "communicate" because Applicant's disclosed method for sending anonymous email to a director is accomplished by replacing the sender's ID with the sender's director ID, which is only known by the channel server. Further, it is unclear what is the relationship between the director and "directed web browsing". Since claim 31 is an independent claim, the term "director" does not naturally assume any predefined meaning from other claims, and thus it needs to be clarified to prevent from being broadly interpreted as, e.g., a director of an organization.
3. Claim 31 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the objection stated in paragraph #2 in this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. Claims 1-3, 6, 10-11, 15-16 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Greer et al.[U.S. Pat. No. 6009429].

5. Greer was cited as a prior art of record in the previous office action.

6. As to claims 1 and 6, Greer teaches the invention as claimed including: a directed web browsing system comprising a customizable director [i.e., a customizable browser], the customizable director operable to provide web browsing capabilities [Abstract; Fig.8; e.g., a browser using the bookmark for touring the web] and comprising:

- a border portion having a forward element, a play element and a back element e.g., Back, Forward, Reload, Fig.2];
- a display portion operable to display a first web page , the first web page having a link, the link having an associated second web page [the display portion of Fig.2, wherein the first page is the home page of a book-marked website and the second page is another web page that is hyper-linked from the home page];
- an exclusive set of first web pages associated with the customizable director [e.g., each of Links 1-3, Fig.7 is a website linking to a first page] and wherein a user associated with the customizable director is required to retrieve at least

Art Unit: 2154

one of the first web pages prior to retrieving a second web page distinct from the first web pages [col.5, lines 41-45; col.6, lines 8-37];

- determining whether a predetermined cycle time associated with the first web page has expired [col.5, lines 8-13]; and
- displaying a third web page in response to the expiration of the predetermined cycle time [i.e., in the dynamic mode the next page is automatically displayed according to a pre-set timer].

7. As to claim 2, Greer further teaches that the customizable director further comprises a timer module operable to determine the expiration of a cycle time associated with the first web pages and generated an indication that the cycle time has expired [Abstract].

8. As to claim 3, Greer further teaches that the customizable director further comprises a unique identifier and wherein the first web pages have an associated uniform resource locator [e.g., Direct Links 1-3, Fig.7, each forming a directed web tour].

9. As to claims 15-16, Greer teaches the invention as claimed including: a method for directed web browsing comprising customizing a director operable to provide web browsing capabilities [Abstract; Figs. 1-2 and 7-8; e.g., the customized browser uses a bookmark file for directed web tour], wherein customizing the director comprises:

- editing a border associated with the director [13, Fig.1; 21-24, Fig.2];

Art Unit: 2154

- editing a display area associated with the director [e.g., the display region of Fig.2 or the urlframe of Fig.1 can be scaled by redefining the frame size];
- adding at least one navigation element to the border [e.g., the taskframe of Fig.7 can be modified by changing the content of task.htm];
- adding at least one sponsor related element to the border , wherein the sponsor comprises a corporation [e.g., the symbol at the top-left corner of Fig.2 is an added sponsor related (i.e., Netscape) element];
- determining a first web page to present to a user associated with the director, the first web page having a link associated with a second web page [i.e., each of the direct links shown in Fig.7 is linked to a first page, which may have a second page linked from there];
- determining a cycle time associated with the first web page, the cycle time indicating the length of time the first web page is to be displayed to the user [Abstract]; and
- preventing the user from requesting a third web page distinct from the first and second web pages [i.e., as a directed web tour, the browser only shows pre-determined web pages; any third page outside the designated web pages is excluded].

10. As to claims 10-11 and 32, since the features of these claims can also be found in claims 1-3 and 15-16, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1-3 and 15-16 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. Claims 4 and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greer et al.(hereafter "Greer")[U.S. Pat. No. 6009429], as applied to claims 1-3, 6, 10-11, 15-16 and 32 above, and further in view of Nobakht et al.(hereafter "Nobakht")[U.S. Pat. No. 6587873], as applied to claim 31 above.

12. As to claim 4, Greer does not specifically teach that the border portion further comprises at least one channel button operable to select a category of content from a channel server.

However, Nobakht teaches a channel-based system server for providing a list of websites that a user may download and browse selected contents.

In view of Nobakht's teaching, it is obvious that the user of Greer's browser may include the channel server's website into one of the border buttons and make Nobakht's channel-based websites available when so requested, because Greer's bookmark is capable of organizing a set of user-selected favorite websites including the home page of a channel server].

13. As to claims 17-18, since the features of these claims can also be found in claims 1-4 and 15-16, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1-4 and 15-16 above.

Art Unit: 2154

14. Claims 5, 25-30 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greer et al. (hereafter "Greer") [U.S. Pat. No. 6009429], as applied to claims 1-4, 6, 10-11, 15-18 and 32 above.

15. As to claim 5, Greer does not specifically teach that the method further comprising a filter module operable to modify the second web page in response to selecting the link based on site criteria associated with the customizable director.

However, under the notion of parental control or pay-for-view in web browsing, it is well known that when an unauthorized page is attempted, the browser is redirected to an alternative page containing a warning message (i.e., linking to a "modified" second web page).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that Greer's browsing system be provided with such function, because by doing so it may give the user a forewarning message so that appropriate actions may be taken following the messages.

16. As to claim 25, Greer teaches substantially as claimed including those limitations disclosed in claim 1. Greer does not specifically teach providing a graphical user interface for displaying a folder, which is installed along with the graphical user interface, and an icon associated with a director so as to facilitate a user interacting with the associated director.

Art Unit: 2154

However, all these additional features are well known in the art. For example, a Microsoft's Internet browser can be invoked by clicking on the icon that is associated with the explorer's executable code in a file folder, wherein file folders are displayed via Microsoft's Explorer tool (a graphical user interface).

It is obvious that Greer's customized browser can also be invoked by clicking its icon from an associated file folder via a graphical file management tool, because this is how a vast majority of application programs are stored and interfaced to the users.

17. As to claims 26-30 and 34, since the features of these claims can also be found in claims 1-5, 15-18 and 25, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1-5, 15-18 and 25 above.

18. Claims 7-9, 12-14, 19-24 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greer et al.(hereafter "Greer")[U.S. Pat. No. 6009429], as applied to claims 1-6, 10-11, 15-18, 25-30, 32 and 34 above, further in view of Walker et al.(hereafter "Walker")[U.S. Pat. No. 6286001].

19. Walker was cited in the previous office action

20. As to claim 7, Greer does not specifically teach that the method further comprising filtering the second web page in response to the selection of the first link based on site criteria associated with the web browser.

However, Walker teaches that a browser system can be adapted to giving parent control over what websites are allowable for a child [Abstract].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Walker's parental control feature in Greer's browser, because prohibiting the minors from browsing unhealthy web pages is a common desire among the responsible parents.

21. As to claim 8, Walker further teaches that filtering the second web page comprises: comparing at least one second link associated with the second web page to at least one forbidden site associated with the site criteria; and removing second links which match at least a portion of any of the forbidden sites associated with the site criteria [710, Fig.7; col.12, lines 55-67].

22. As to claims 9 and 12, since the features of these claims can also be found in claims 6-8, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 6-8 above.

23. As to claims 22-24, Greer and Walker do not specifically teach measuring network performance, such as the latency, between the director (i.e., the browser) and a remote site and pass this information to a channel server.

However, measuring communication delay between two network nodes is a well-known art. Since Greer and Walker's system is targeted at remote data accessing

Art Unit: 2154

including real-time data presentation (such as audio and video programs), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply a well-known communication delay measurement method for determining the delay between the client and the remote information source, because the channel server, which functions as a real-time data distributor, would require the delay information in order to allocate necessary network resources to satisfy the need.

24. As to claims 13-14, 19-21 and 33, since the features of these claims can also be found in claims 1-12, 15-18, 22-30, 32 and 34, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1-12, 15-18, 22-30, 32 and 34 above.

25. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Kurganov, [US 20010054085 A1]; and

Lowery, [US 6446111 B1].

26. Applicant's arguments filed on 4/12/2004 for claims 1-30 and 32-34 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

27. Applicant argues in the remarks that:

Greer does not teach a client-side director because Greer clearly teaches that the director resides in a web server.

Art Unit: 2154

28. Examiner respectfully disagrees with applicant's remarks.

Specifically, it is noted that the claim language of claim 1 does not preclude a web-touring director from being residing in a server. Moreover, the previous office action clearly relates the "customizable director" as a "customizable browser" (see the parenthesized remark) providing customizable bookmark for web touring. Thus, together with Greer's server-side director, the customizable browser provides web-browsing capabilities in a client-server system.

For at least the above reasons, it is asserted that the prior art of record reads on claims 1-30 and 32-34.

29. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

30. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2154

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wen-Tai Lin whose telephone number is (703)305-4875. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday(8:00-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (703) 305-8498. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703) 872-9306 for official communications; and

(703)746-5516 for status inquires draft communication.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-3900.

Wen-Tai Lin

May 17, 2004

Wen-Tai Lin
5/17/04